arXiv:1401.0100v1 [stat.ME] 31 Dec 2013

MODELING COVARIATE-CONTINGENT CORRELATION AND TAIL-DEPENDENCE WITH COPULAS

FENG LI

Abstract. Copulas provide an attractive approach for constructing multivariate densities with flexible marginal distributions and different forms of dependence. Of particular importance in many areas is the possibility of explicitly modeling tail-dependence. Most of the available approaches estimate tail-dependence and correlations via nuisance parameters, yielding results that are neither tractable nor interpretable for practitioners. We propose a general Bayesian approach for directly modeling tail-dependence and correlations as explicit functions of covariates. Our method allows for variable selection among the covariates in the marginal models and in the copula parameters. Posterior inference is carried out using a novel and efficient MCMC simulation method.

Keywords: Covariate-dependent copula; Bayesian variable selection; tail-dependence; Kendall's τ; MCMC.

1. Introduction

Copula modeling has been an active research area dating back to Sklar's theorem (Sklar, 1959) in which he proves that a multivariate cumulative distribution function $F(x_1, ..., x_M)$ can be written in terms of univariate marginal distributions and a copula function $C(u_1, ..., u_M)$, where $u_i = F_i(x_i)$ is the i:th marginal CDF. Various properties and applications of copulas have thereafter been studied, see e.g. Nelsen (2006) for an introduction to copulas, Joe (1997) for dependence and extreme value distribution with copulas, and Dorota (2010) for constructions of multivariate dependences using bivariate copulas.

Copula models have been widely used in financial applications due to its ability in modeling tail-dependence and correlations, see Patton (2012b) for a recent survey. Jaworski et al. (2010) reviews the state of the art approaches in copula estimation, including pair-copula constructions (Czado, 2010). An important concept in copula modeling is the tail-dependence. In bivariate copulas, the tail-dependence describes the dependence of random variables in the tail: $\lim_{u\to 0^+} p(X_1 < F_1^{-1}(u)|X_2 < F_2^{-1}(u))$ is called the lower tail-dependence and $\lim_{u\to 1^-} p(X_1 > F_1^{-1}(u)|X_2 > F_2^{-1}(u))$ is the upper tail-dependence for the two random variables X_1 and X_2. Dobrić & Schmid (2005) use nonparametric methods to estimate the lower tail-dependence in bivariate copulas with continuous marginals. Schmidt & Stadtmuller (2006) explore the tail-dependence estimators for the *tail copula* where the lower tail copula and upper tail copula for a bivariate copula C are defined as $\lim_{t\to\infty} tC(x/t, y/t)$ and $\lim_{t\to\infty}(x + y - t + tC(x/t, y/t))$ respectively, if the limits exist. Another special case in the tail-dependence is the asymptotically independent: x_1 and x_2 are asymptotically independent if $F(x_1, x_2) = \lim_{x_1\to\infty} F(x_1, x_2) \lim_{x_2\to\infty} F(x_1, x_2)$. We do not further explore this possibility but see Draisma et al. (2004) for hypothesis testing to detect the dependence of

Feng Li (feng.li@cufe.edu.cn): School of Statistics and Mathematics, Central University of Finance and Economics, 100081 Beijing, China.

extreme events when they are asymptotically independent, and for the study of asymptotic dependence case, see e.g. Ledford & Tawn (1997).

Among the vast and extensive literature in copula modeling, few articles have investigated the underlying causes of the dependence structures. This is partially because the computational complexity is still a challenge in many situations, which explains the relatively simplistic models used for the copula. Moreover, most copula approaches for modeling rank correlation and tail-dependence for existing copulas require firstly modeling intermediate parameters and obtaining the correlation and tail-dependence in the end. Thus the results are neither tractable nor interpretable for practitioners. In this paper we present a general Bayesian approach for copula modeling with explanatory variables entering both the tail-dependence and correlation parameters in the copula function. This construction allows us to explore the drivers of the different forms of dependence between the variables. We propose an efficient MCMC simulation method for the posterior inference which also allows for variable selection in both the marginal models and the copula *features*. In this paper a feature stands for a characteristic in the copula function, e.g. Kendall's τ and tail-dependence are two features of a copula.

The outline of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the Bayesian covariate-dependent copula model and Section 2.3 introduces the reparametrized Joe-Clayton copula with some new properties. We discuss the prior specification for the model and present the general form for copula posterior in Section 3. Section 4 presents the details of the MCMC scheme. In Section 5 we apply the model to the daily returns from the S&P100 and S&P600 stock market indices. Section 6 concludes the paper and discusses potential directions for further research. The appendix of the paper documents the necessary analytical computation used in the MCMC.

2. The copula model

A copula is a multivariate distribution that separates the univariate marginals and the multivariate dependence structure. The correspondence between a multivariate distribution $F(x_1, ..., x_M)$ and a copula function $C(u_1, ..., u_M)$ can be expressed as

$$F(x_1, ..., x_M) = F(F_1^{-1}(u_1), ..., F_M^{-1}(u_M)) = C(u_1, ..., u_M) = C(F_1(x_1), ..., F_M(x_M))$$

where the correspondence is one to one with continuous marginal distributions. Copulas provide a general approach to constructing more flexible multivariate densities. For example, the bivariate Gaussian copula $C(u_1, u_2|\rho) = \Psi(F_1^{-1}(u_1), F_2^{-1}(u_2)|\rho)$ with the correlation parameter ρ, is a relaxed Gaussian density in the sense that $F_1(\cdot)$ and $F_2(\cdot)$ do not need to be normal, see e.g. Pitt et al. (2006). New classes of multivariate densities are possible to construct in terms of copulas, see Joe (1997) for details. A key feature in copula models is that the multivariate dependence structure does not depend on the marginal densities. Thus multivariate modeling with copulas consists of two parts: i) separate modeling of each marginal distribution and, ii) modeling the multivariate dependence.

2.1. Marginal models.

In this paper we use *margins* as synonym of marginal models. In principle, the copula approach can be used with any margins, but we will assume the margins to be split-t distributions (Li et al., 2010) in our application in Section 5. The split-t is a flexible four-parameter distribution with

the student's t, the asymmetric normal and symmetric normal distributions as its special cases; see Li et al. (2010) for some properties of the split-t distribution.

Following Li et al. (2010) we allow the location parameter μ, the scale parameter ϕ, the degrees of freedom ν and the skewness parameter κ in the split-t density in the margins to be linked to covariates as

(1) $\mu_{ij} = x'_{ij}\beta_{\mu_j}$
(2) $\phi_{ij} = \exp(x'_{ij}\beta_{\phi_j})$
(3) $\nu_{ij} = \exp(x'_{ij}\beta_{\nu_j})$
(4) $\kappa_{ij} = \exp(x'_{ij}\beta_{\lambda_j})$, for $i = 1, ..., n$, $j = 1, ..., M$

where x_{ij} is the covariate vector for the i:th observation in the j:th margin.

One may also consider using mixture models in the margins. Li et al. (2010) show in an application to S&P500 data that the one-component split-t model with all parameters linked to covariates does well in comparison with mixtures of split-t components. In this paper, we will therefore use the one-component split-t model for demonstration purposes. Note that it is possible to also specify different margins. Our inference procedure can be generally applied.

2.2. **Dependence concepts.** Modeling the multivariate dependence typically involves quantifying two important quantities: correlation and tail-dependence. In copula models, the correlation between two variables are usually measured with rank correlations like Kendall's τ

$$\tau = 4\int\int F(x_1, x_2)\mathrm{d}F(x_1, x_2) - 1 = 4\int\int C(u_1, u_2)\mathrm{d}C(u_1, u_2) - 1.$$

In this paper we focus on modeling Kendall's τ, but our methodology also applies to other correlations like Spearman's ρ. The tail-dependence describes the concordance between extreme values of random variables X_1 and X_2. The lower tail-dependence λ_L and the upper tail-dependence λ_L can also be expressed in terms bivariate copulas

$$\lambda_L = \lim_{u\to 0^+} p(X_1 < F_1^{-1}(u)|X_2 < F_2^{-1}(u)) = \lim_{u\to 0^+} \frac{C(u,u)}{u},$$
$$\lambda_U = \lim_{u\to 1^-} p(X_1 > F_1^{-1}(u)|X_2 > F_2^{-1}(u)) = \lim_{u\to 1^-} \frac{1-C(u,u)}{1-u}.$$

In principle, correlations and tail-dependencies can attain all values in the domain $[-1, 1]$, but not all copulas can specify them in the whole interval. For example the Clayton copula and Gumbel copula (Joe, 1997) can only have positive correlations and tail-dependence. Gumbel exhibits strong upper tail-dependence and relatively weak lower tail-dependence. The Fréchet–Hoeffding bounds can help us to select a proper copula that describes the dependence correctly. The copula function satisfies the inequalities

$$\sum_{i=1}^{M} u_i - M + 1 \leq C(u_1, ..., u_M) \leq \min\{u_1, ..., u_M\}$$

where the left and right bounds are Fréchet–Hoeffding lower and upper bounds, respectively. In the bivariate case, if the copula is close to the upper bound, it shows strong positive dependence and if the copula is close to the lower bound, it shows strong negative dependence, see Nelsen (2006) for the proof.

2.3. **The reparametrized Joe-Clayton copula.** In this paper we focus on the bivariate copula modeling with the two-parameter Joe-Clayton copula, which is commonly used in the literature. Our copula modeling approach is general and can be applied to modeling any copulas with any feature of interest. The popular Vine copula construction (Aas et al., 2009; Czado et al., 2012) can also be used to extend our bivariate copula modeling to higher dimensions.

2.3.1. *The copula density.* The Joe-Clayton copula, also known as the BB7 copula, was introduced by Joe (1997) and is of the form

$$\begin{aligned} C(u,v|\theta,\delta) =& \eta(\eta^{-1}(u)+\eta^{-1}(v)) \\ =& 1-\left[1-\left\{\left(1-\bar{u}^{\theta}\right)^{-\delta}+\left(1-\bar{v}^{\theta}\right)^{-\delta}-1\right\}^{-1/\delta}\right]^{1/\theta} \end{aligned}$$

where $\eta(s) = 1-[1-(1+s)^{-1/\delta}]^{1/\theta}$, $\theta \geq 1$, $\delta > 0$, $\bar{u} = 1-u$, $\bar{v} = 1-v$ with lower tail-dependence parameter $\lambda_L = 2^{-1/\delta}$ and upper tail-dependence parameter $\lambda_U = 2-2^{1/\theta}$. The copula density function for the Joe-Clayton copula is then

$$\begin{aligned} c(u,v|\theta,\delta) = \frac{\partial^2 C(u,v,\theta,\delta)}{\partial u \partial v} =& \left[T_1(u)T_1(v)\right]^{-1-\delta} T_2(u)T_2(v)L_1^{-2(1+\delta)/\delta} \\ & \times (1-L_1^{-1/\delta})^{1/\theta-2}\left[(1+\delta)\theta L_1^{1/\delta}-\theta\delta-1\right] \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $T_1(s) = 1-(1-s)^{\theta}$, $T_2(s) = (1-s)^{\theta-1}$ and $L_1 = T_1(v)^{-\delta}+T_1(u)^{-\delta}-1$.

The Joe-Clayton copula has been widely used in modeling tail-dependence. Patton (2006) uses a symmetric version of Joe-Clayton copula to model time-varying dependence with its autoregressive terms for daily return of the Deutsche mark with the U.S. dollar and the Japanese yen with U.S. dollar. Aas et al. (2009) and Czado et al. (2012) among others develop a flexible class of multivariate copulas allowing multivariate dependence via a vine structure based on bivariate copulas, including the Joe-Clayton copula. Bouyé & Salmon (2009) apply the Joe-Clayton copula to a quantile regression that allows both positive and negative slopes for the quantile curves. But none of these works have a model that can explain the driving forces behind the dependence structures.

2.3.2. *Kendall's τ.* Kendall's τ of the Joe-Clayton copula for the case $1 \leq \theta < 2$ can be found in e.g, Smith & Khaled (2012). We now present the full expression for all $\theta \geq 1$.

$$\tau(\theta,\delta) = \begin{cases} 1-2/[\delta(2-\theta)]+4B\left(\delta+2,2/\theta-1\right)/(\theta^2\delta), & 1 \leq \theta < 2; \\ 1-\left[\psi(2+\delta)-\psi(1)-1\right]/\delta, & \theta = 2; \\ 1-2/[\delta(2-\theta)]-4\pi/\left[\theta^2\delta(2+\delta)\sin(2\pi/\theta)B\left(1+\delta+2/\theta,2-2/\theta\right)\right], & \theta > 2, \end{cases}$$

where $B(\cdot)$ is the beta function and $\psi(\cdot)$ is the digamma function. It is easy verified that Kendall's τ is continuous for all $\theta \geq 1$.

If we employ the equations $\delta = -\log 2/\log\lambda_L$ and $\theta = \log 2/\log(2-\lambda_U)$ to the preceding result, we can rewrite the Kendall's τ in terms of lower and upper tail-dependence as $\tau(\lambda_L,\lambda_U)$, see Figure 1 for a contour plot of these relationships.



FIGURE 1. Contour plot of the Kendall's τ with respect to lower tail-dependence (λ_L) and upper tail-dependence (λ_U) for the Joe-Clayton copula.

The Joe-Clayton copula can only determine positive correlations. If the relationship between two variables is negative, we just need to rotate the axes of the copula and the estimation procedure remains the same. For example, for copulas rotated by 90 degrees, u has to be set to $1-u$; for 270 degrees let v be $1-v$ and for 180 degrees set u and v to $1-u$ and $1-v$, respectively. See Durrleman et al. (2000) for the proof that after this transformation it is still a copula and for other possible transformations to extend current bivariate copula with desired properties. In the financial application in Section 5, the correlations are known to be positive, but modeling negative correlations requires no extra work also for other copulas than the Joe-Clayton copula.

2.3.3. *Some properties.* The Joe-Clayton copula has some unique attributes. The upper tail-dependence and lower tail-dependence are not functionally dependent. The Clayton copula (Clayton, 1978) and the B5 copula (Joe, 1993) are special cases of the Joe-Clayton copula. All of them belong to a more general class of Archimedean copulas. Furthermore, we also find the following new properties.

(1) The inequality holds $0 \leq \lambda_L \leq 2^{1/2-1/(2\tau)}$ when the lower tail-dependence is not extremely high. We say that λ_L and τ are *variationally dependent*. The proof is non-trivial, but we have verified the inequality numerically in a very careful way. We discover the bound of the inequality through the limit of $\tau(\lambda_L, \lambda_U)$ when $\lambda_U \to 0$, see Figure 1 for an illustrative plot.

(2) When $\lambda_L \to 0$ (i.e. $\delta \to 0$), we have

$$\tau \to 1 - \frac{2H(2/\theta) - 2}{2 - \theta} = 1 - \frac{2H(2\log(2-\lambda_u)/\log 2) - 2}{2 - \log 2/\log(2-\lambda_u)}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial \tau}{\partial \theta} \to \frac{2(1 - H(2/\theta))}{(\theta-2)^2} - \frac{4\psi_1(2/\theta + 1)}{(\theta-2)\theta^2}$$

where $H(\cdot)$ is the Harmonic number. A special case is when $\theta \to 2$ (i.e. $\lambda_U \to 2 - \sqrt{2} \approx 0.59$), we have $\tau \to 2 - \pi^2/6 \approx 0.36$ and $\partial\tau/\partial\theta \to \pi^2/12 - Zeta(3)/2 \approx 0.22$. where $Zeta(\cdot)$ is the Riemann zeta function.

(3) Furthermore, we also have derived the analytical gradients for the copula density with respect to Kendall's τ and tail-dependence of Joe-Clayton copula in Appendix A.2, which will be used to construct efficient proposal distributions for MCMC.

2.3.4. *Reparametrization.* The parameters in most copula functions do not directly represent the copula features, see e.g. the tail-dependence parameters and Kendall's τ in the Joe-Clayton copula. In this section we describe how to reparameterize the copula function so that the parameters are the copula features of interest.

To simplify the interpretation of the copula model, we parameterize it in terms of lower tail-dependency parameter λ_L and Kendall's τ,

$$\begin{aligned} C(u,v|\lambda_L,\tau) =& 1 - \Bigg[1 - \Bigg\{\left[1 - \bar{u}^{\log 2/\log(2-\tau^{-1}(\lambda_L))}\right]^{\log 2/\log\lambda_L} \\ &+ \left[1 - \bar{v}^{\log 2/\log(2-\tau^{-1}(\lambda_L))}\right]^{\log 2/\log\lambda_L} - 1\Bigg\}^{\log\lambda_L/\log 2}\Bigg]^{\log(2-\tau^{-1}(\lambda_L))/\log 2} \end{aligned}$$

where $\tau^{-1}(\lambda_L)$ is the inverse function of Kendall's τ given λ_L, i.e. the upper tail-dependence λ_U. And the related reparametrized copula density is obtained by substituting $\delta = -\log 2/\log\lambda_L$ and $\theta = \log 2/\log(2 - \tau^{-1}(\lambda_L))$ from (1).

An attractive property of Kendall's τ is that it is invariant with respect strictly monotonic transforms. Other types of correlation like Spearman's rank correlation can be equally well modeled with our method. For measuring the dependence in trivariate distributions, one may consider using a three-dimensional version of correlations, see e.g. García et al. (2013). Correlations in higher dimensions are usually estimated pairwise.

Our parameterization has two main advantages. Firstly, it reduces the efforts for specifying the prior information in our Bayesian approach in Section 3. Secondly, and most importantly, this parameterization make it possible to directly link correlations and tail-dependence to covariates, see Section 2.4 for details.

Modeling the upper tail-dependence is also important in financial applications. There are also alternative reparametrization schemes that allow modeling upper tail dependence parameter λ_L directly. A simple way to achieve the same effect is to rotate the copula for 180 degrees in our parameterization.

2.4. **Covariate-dependent copula parameters.** Letting the Kendall's τ and tail-dependence parameters in copula modeling be fixed numbers is very restrictive. This is particularly true in financial time-series

applications where the tail-dependence has been shown to vary with time (Patton, 2006). We introduce a covariate-dependent copula model that allows the copula features to be linked to observed covariate information. A prominent example is covariate-dependent correlation and tail-dependence:

(1) $\tau = l_\tau^{-1}(\boldsymbol{x}'\boldsymbol{\beta}_\tau)$
(2) $\lambda = l_\lambda^{-1}(\boldsymbol{x}'\boldsymbol{\beta}_\lambda)$

where λ without subscripts represents the dependence parameter in the lower and/or upper tail, τ is Kendall's τ, and $\boldsymbol{x}$ is the set of covariates used in the margins. Furthermore $l_\tau(\cdot)$ and $l_\lambda(\cdot)$ are suitable link functions that connect λ and τ with $\boldsymbol{x}$. Other copula parameters can be linked to covariates in the same way.

Patton (2006) allows ARMA-like variation in the dependence parameter. Our approach makes it possible to use all marginal information to model the dependence parameters. This approach not only leads to more interesting interpretations of the features, but generates more accurate forecasts (see Section 5.3) and allows for heteroscedasticity in the dependence parameters. We also use variable selection to select meaningful covariates that influence the dependence. Furthermore, variable selection also reduces the model complexity and prevents overfitting, see Section 4 for details.

3. The prior and posterior

We use the same technique to specify the priors for the marginal parameters and the prior in the copula features. We omit the subscript that indicates the functionality of the parameter in this section for convenience. We will first assume that the model parameters are independent *a priori*, and then turn to a more general situation with dependent model parameters in Section 3.3.

Let $\mathcal{I}$ be the variable selection indicator for a given covariate

$$\mathcal{I}_j = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \beta_j \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } \beta_j = 0, \end{cases}$$

where β_j is the jth covariate in the model. More informally, this can be expressed as

$$\mathcal{I}_j = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if variable } j \text{ enters the model} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We standardize each covariate to have zero mean and unit variance and assume prior independence between the intercept β_0 and the slope β. We can decompose the joint prior as

$$p(\beta_0, \beta, \mathcal{I}) = p(\beta_0)p(\beta, \mathcal{I}) = p(\beta_0)p(\beta|\mathcal{I})p(\mathcal{I}).$$

We will use normal priors for both β_0 and β. We also assume that the intercept is always included in each parameter, so the variable selection indicator for β_0 is always one.

3.1. Prior for the intercept .

We set the prior for the intercept by following the strategy in Villani et al. (2012) that firstly puts prior information on the model parameters (e.g. τ and λ_L in the Joe-Clayton copula), and then derive the implied prior on the intercept β_0 under the assumption that the covariates are at their means. The technique can be applied to the following two situations directly. When the link is the

identity, setting the implied prior on the model parameter is trivially the same as on the intercept. When the link is the log function, assuming a log-normal distribution on the model parameter with mean m and variance σ^2 yields a normal prior with mean $\log(m) - \log[\sigma^2/m^2 + 1]/2$ and variance $\log[\sigma^2/m^2 + 1]$ in the intercept.

We now generalize this to a general situation that can be applied to any link function with any distribution. We take the tail-dependence parameter λ as an example, where $0 < \lambda < 1$ in some copula functions, e.g. the Joe-Clayton copula in Section 2.3. It is natural to consider using the logit link to connect the tail-dependence λ with covariates. When there is only an intercept in the covariates, we have $\lambda = 1/(1 + \exp(-\beta_0))$. Therefore, if we assume λ to have a beta distribution $Beta(m, \sigma^2)$ with mean m and variance σ^2, we have the mean and variance for β_0 as

$$E(\beta_0) = \int_0^1 \log(\frac{x}{1-x}) Beta(x, m, \sigma^2) \mathrm{d}x = \psi(\alpha_1) - \psi(\alpha_2),$$
$$V(\beta_0) = \int_0^1 (\log(\frac{x}{1-x}))^2 Beta(x, m, \sigma^2) \mathrm{d}x - E^2(\beta_0) = \psi_1(\alpha_1) + \psi_1(\alpha_2)$$

where $\psi(\cdot)$ and $\psi_1(\cdot)$ are the digamma and trigamma functions respectively, $\alpha_1 = -m(m^2 - m + \sigma^2)/\sigma^2$ and $\alpha_2 = -1 + m + (m-1)^2 m/\sigma^2$. Higher order moments are also possible to obtain either analytically or numerically. We can now set the prior on the intercept β_0 based on the derived mean and variance information. The prior for the intercept in the Kendall's τ parameter can be elicited in the same fashion but the integration domain and link function should be changed accordingly.

3.2. **Prior for the slope and variable selection indicators.** We first consider the case without variable selection. We assume that the slopes are normally distributed with mean 0 and covariance matrix Σ. The extension to a non-zero mean is trivial. The covariance matrix is defined as $\Sigma = c^2 \cdot P^{-1}$ where P is a positive definite symmetric matrix and c is a scaling factor. In the application, P is the identity matrix. Using the inverse Fisher information for P as in Villani et al. (2012) is also possibility.

We now consider the case with variable selection. Conditional on the variable selection indicators, the slopes are still normal distributed with mean $\mu_{\mathcal{I}} + \Sigma_{21}\Sigma_{\mathcal{I}^c}^{-1}(\beta_{\mathcal{I}^c} - \mu_{\mathcal{I}^c})$ and covariance matrix becomes $\Sigma_{\mathcal{I}} - \Sigma_{21}\Sigma_{\mathcal{I}^c}^{-1}\Sigma_{12}$ (Mardia & Kent, 1979), with obvious notations. The prior for each variable selection indicator is identically Bernoulli distributed with probability of p.

A shrinkage prior is often used as an alternative method for reducing model complexity. In our experience, the choice between variable selection and shrinkage estimator depends on the context of the application. Variable selection is usually used to select meaningful variables, which is of great interest here as we are exploring which variables that explain or drive the dependence among variables. See also Vach et al. (2001) for a comparison for the two approaches in some commonly used models.

3.3. **Priors when the parameters are dependent.** In this section we consider a special case when two or more model parameters are dependent *a priori*. When we reparametrize the original density function in terms of other parameters, it is common to introduce a variational dependence between the new parameters in the sense that the outcome of one parameter puts a restriction on the domain of the other parameter. In our model, the original Joe-Clayton copula has two parameters θ and δ which are variationally independent. When we reparametrize it in terms of lower tail-dependence and Kendall's τ, Section 2.3.3 shows

the inequality between the two parameters (see Figure 1 for a visualization of the relations between the parameters).

As before, our aim is to elicit a prior on $\beta_{\tau_0,}, \beta_\tau, \beta_{\lambda_0}$ and β_λ via an elicited joint distribution on τ and λ. When the parameters are variationally dependent and we can no longer assume prior independence and instead we decompose the joint prior for the model parameters as

$$p(\tau, \lambda) = p(\tau|\lambda)p(\lambda). \tag{2}$$

The marginal priors for $\beta_{\lambda_0}, \beta_\lambda$ and its variable selection indicators $\mathcal{I}_\lambda$ are the same as in Section 3.1 and Section 3.2. We will now document the prior for $\beta_{\tau_0}, \beta_\tau$ and its variable selection indicators $\mathcal{I}_\tau$ conditional on λ.

We first introduce the generalized beta function and the generalized logit link function.

Definition 1. ***The generalized beta distribution.*** *Let $gBeta(x, a, b, m, \sigma)$ be the generalized beta distribution with mean m, standard deviation σ where $a < x < b$. Then $(x-a)/(b-a)$ follows the beta distribution with mean $(m-a)/(b-a)$ and standard deviation $\sigma/(b-a)$.*

Definition 2. ***The generalized logit function.*** *The generalized logit function that extends the logit function with two parameters a and b as*

$$glogit(x, a, b) = a + \frac{b-a}{1+\exp(-x)},$$

where $a < x < b$.

The generalized beta distribution and the generalized logit link function now both have two boundary parameters a and b. Furthermore, when $a = 0$ and $b = 1$, they reduce to their usual form.

Based on the decomposition in (2) we now assume that τ in Section 2 follows a generalized beta distribution $gBeta(x, a, b, m, \sigma)$ conditional on λ with the generalized logit link $glogit(X_\tau\beta_\tau, a, b)$ where $a = \log(2)/(\log(2) - \log(\lambda))$ and $b = 1$. We can now elicit the prior on the intercept, slopes and variable selection indicators for τ conditional on λ by following Section 3.1 and Section 3.2.

Furthermore, for conditional dependence with more than two parameters, we can always decompose the joint distribution with pairwise conditional distributions and apply the technique thereafter. It is shown in our application that the conditional link function used in the prior also makes the MCMC algorithm more robust and gives higher acceptance probability in Metropolis-Hastings algorithm compared to the case where the prior is simply truncated to the region of allowed (τ, λ) pairs and all proposal draws outside this region are rejected in the MCMC.

3.4. **The joint posterior.** The posterior in the copula model can be written in terms of the likelihoods from the marginal distributions, the copula likelihood and the prior for parameters in the copula and marginal distributions as

$$\begin{aligned}\log p(\{\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{I}}\}|\boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{x}) =& \text{constant} + \sum_{j=1}^{M} \log p(\boldsymbol{y}_{\cdot j}|\{\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{I}}\}_j, \boldsymbol{x}_j) \\ &+ \log \mathcal{L}_C(\boldsymbol{u}|\{\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{I}}\}_C, \boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{x}) + \log p(\{\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{I}}\})\end{aligned}$$

where $\log p(\boldsymbol{y}_{\cdot j}|\{\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\mathcal{I}}\}_j,\boldsymbol{x}_j)$ is the log likelihood in j:th margin, the sets $\{\beta,\mathcal{I}\}_j$ are the parameter blocks in the j:th margin. Furthermore, $\boldsymbol{u}=(\mathbf{u}_1,...,\mathbf{u}_M)$, where $\mathbf{u}_j=(u_{1j},...,u_{nj})'$ and $u_{ij}=F_j(y_{ij})$, and $F_j(\cdot)$ is the CDF of the j:th marginal distribution and $\mathcal{L}_C$ is the likelihood for the copula function. In our application, we have $M=2$ and we use the reparametrized Joe-Clayton copula defined in Section 2.3.4.

4. The general MCMC scheme

We update the copula component together with the marginal components jointly. The joint posterior is not tractable and we use the Metropolis–Hastings within Gibbs sampler, i.e. a Gibbs sampler is used for updating the joint parameter components, with each conditional parameter block $\{\boldsymbol{\beta},\boldsymbol{\mathcal{I}}\}$ updated by the Metropolis–Hastings algorithm. The complete updating scheme is as follows.

4.1. **Metropolis–Hastings within Gibbs.** The updating order in the Gibbs sampler is given in Table 1. We jointly update the coefficients and variable selection indicators $\{\beta,\mathcal{I}\}$ in each parameter block using an efficient tailored Metropolis–Hastings algorithm with integrated finite-step Newton proposals. The acceptance probability for a proposed draw $\{\beta^{(p)},\mathcal{I}^{(p)}\}$ conditional on current value of the parameters $\{\beta^{(c)},\mathcal{I}^{(c)}\}$ is

$$\min\left[1,\frac{p(\{\beta^{(p)},\mathcal{I}^{(p)}\}|\{\beta^{(c)},\mathcal{I}^{(c)}\},Y,X)g(\{\beta^{(c)},\mathcal{I}^{(c)}\}|\{\beta^{(p)},\mathcal{I}^{(p)}\})}{p(\{\beta^{(c)},\mathcal{I}^{(c)}\}|\{\beta^{(p)},\mathcal{I}^{(p)}\},Y,X)g(\{\beta^{(p)},\mathcal{I}^{(p)}\}|\{\beta^{(c)},\mathcal{I}^{(c)}\})}\right] \tag{3}$$

where $g(\cdot)$ is the jumping rule in the Metropolis-Hastings for $\{\beta,\mathcal{I}\}$. Note that it is convenient to decompose $g(\{\beta^{(p)},\mathcal{I}^{(p)}\}|\{\beta^{(c)},\mathcal{I}^{(c)}\}=g_1(\beta^{(p)}|\{\beta^{(c)},\mathcal{I}^{(p)}\}_i)g_2(\mathcal{I}^{(p)}|\{\beta^{(c)},\mathcal{I}^{(c)}\})$. And $g_1(\cdot)$ is the proposal distribution where the proposal mode is from finite-step Newton approximation of the posterior distribution (usually smaller than three steps) starting on current draw and the proposal covariance matrix is from the negative inverse Hessian matrix. In our application, $g_1(\cdot)$ is multivariate t distribution with six degrees of freedom. The distribution of $g_2(\cdot)$ is such that we always propose a change of $\mathcal{I}$: a currently excluded variable is proposed to enter the model, and vice versa. We do not allow all indicator to change in a given iteration, each indicator is proposed to change with probability p_{prop}. This simple scheme works well in the copula model. For alternative types of variable selection schemes, see e.g. Nott & Kohn (2005).

The updating scheme is used in e.g. Villani et al. (2009) and Villani et al. (2012) where it is shown that Metropolis–Hastings with finite-step Newton proposals increases the convergence rate rapidly. The algorithm only requires the gradient for the marginal distribution and copula model with respect to their the (low-dimensional) parameters. Appendix A.1 documents the details for calculating the gradient with respect to copula features for reparametrized copulas in the MCMC implementation with both independent and dependent link functions.

An alternative approach is the two-stage estimation method which first independently estimate the margins and then estimates the copula likelihood conditional on the estimated margins, see e.g. Xu (1996) and Joe (1997). The two-stage estimation method is widely used as it reduces the computational difficulty in maximizing the likelihood for high-dimensional copula models. Joe (2005) shows that the asymptotic relative efficiency of the two-stage estimation procedure depends on how close the copula is to the Fréchet bounds. The initial values for the MCMC are obtained by numerical optimization of the posterior distribution. Alternatively, one can use the estimates from a two-stage approach as initial values. An R package for estimating the covariate-dependent copula model with our MCMC scheme is available upon request.

TABLE 1. The Gibbs sampler for covariate-dependent copula. The notation $\{\beta_\mu, \mathcal{I}_\mu\}_m$ denotes the covariates coefficients and variable selection indicators in copula component m for parameter feature μ. And the notation $\{\beta_\mu, \mathcal{I}_\mu\}_{-m}$ indicates all other parameters in the model except $\{\beta_\mu, \mathcal{I}_\mu\}_m$. The updating order is column-wise from left to right. If dependent link functions are used, the updating should be ordered accordingly.

Margin component (1)	...	Margin component (M)	Copula component (C)
(1.1) $\{\beta_\mu, \mathcal{I}_\mu\}_1 \vert \{\beta_\mu, \mathcal{I}_\mu\}_{-1}$	...	(M.1) $\{\beta_\mu, \mathcal{I}_\mu\}_M \vert \{\beta_\mu, \mathcal{I}_\mu\}_{-M}$	(C.1) $\{\beta_\lambda, \mathcal{I}_\lambda\}_C \vert \{\beta_\lambda, \mathcal{I}_\lambda\}_{-C}$
(1.2) $\{\beta_\phi, \mathcal{I}_\phi\}_1 \vert \{\beta_\phi, \mathcal{I}_\phi\}_{-1}$	...	(M.2) $\{\beta_\phi, \mathcal{I}_\phi\}_M \vert \{\beta_\phi, \mathcal{I}_\phi\}_{-M}$	(C.2) $\{\beta_\tau, \mathcal{I}_\tau\}_C \vert \{\beta_\tau, \mathcal{I}_\tau\}_{-C}$
(1.3) $\{\beta_\nu, \mathcal{I}_\nu\}_1 \vert \{\beta_\nu, \mathcal{I}_\nu\}_{-1}$	...	(M.3) $\{\beta_\nu, \mathcal{I}_\nu\}_M \vert \{\beta_\nu, \mathcal{I}_\nu\}_{-M}$	
(1.4) $\{\beta_\kappa, \mathcal{I}_\kappa\}_1 \vert \{\beta_\kappa, \mathcal{I}_\kappa\}_{-1}$	...	(M.4) $\{\beta_\kappa, \mathcal{I}_\kappa\}_M \vert \{\beta_\kappa, \mathcal{I}_\kappa\}_{-M}$	

5. Application to financial data

In order to illustrate our method, we use an financial application with daily stock returns. The copula model is the reparametrized Joe-Clayton copula with split-t distributions on the continuous margins. For the discrete case, see e.g. the approach by latent variables for the Gaussian copula in Pitt et al. (2006) and the extension to a general copula in Smith & Khaled (2012).

5.1. **The S&P100 and S&P600 data.** Our data are daily returns from the S&P100 and S&P600 daily stock market indices during the period from September 15, 1995 to January 16, 2013. The S&P100 index includes the largest and most established companies in the U.S. which is a subset of the well-known S&P500 index. The S&P600 index covers the small capitalization companies which present the possibility of greater capital appreciation, but at greater risk. The S&P600 index covers roughly three percent of the total US equities market.

Patton (2012a) uses hypothesis tests to show that there is significant time-varying dependence between S&P100 and S&P600. Both parametric and nonparametric methods are used to estimate the tail-dependence coefficient in different copula models in Patton (2012a). Nevertheless, little effort has been devote to interpreting the dependence, in particular from using covariate information.

The covariates we used in the margins and in the copula function are described in Table 2. Villani et al. (2009) and Li et al. (2010) apply similar covariates in univariate response regression density estimation on S&P500 data using mixtures of Gaussian and asymmetric student's t densities.

Figure 2 shows the time series of the daily returns. It is seen that there is huge volatility in the returns for both S&P100 and S&P600 during the 2008 financial crisis. Figure 3 depicts the empirical copula $\hat{C}_n$ for Return estimated as proposed by Dobrić & Schmid (2005) by assuming independent observations

$$\hat{C}_n(\frac{i}{n}, \frac{j}{n}) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n} 1(Y_{1k} \leq Y_{1(i)}, Y_{2k} \leq Y_{2(j)})$$

for $i, j = 1, ..., n$, where $Y_{1(1)} \leq, ..., \leq Y_{1(n)}$ and $Y_{2(1)} \leq, ..., \leq Y_{2(n)}$ are the ordered values of Return for S&P100 and S&P600, respectively. Figure 3 shows that the empirical copula is very close to the Fréchet-Hoeffding upper bound copula, which means extreme positive dependence between data S&P100

TABLE 2. Description of variables in the S&P100 and S&P600 data.

Variable	Description
Return	Daily return $y_t = 100 \log(p_t/p_{t-1})$ where p_t is the closing price.
RM1	Return of last day.
RM5	Return of last week.
RM20	Return of last month.
CloseAbs95	Geometrically decaying average of absolute returns $(1-\rho)\sum_{s=0}^{\infty}\rho^s\lvert y_{t-2-s}\rvert$ with $\rho = 0.95$.
CloseAbs80	Geometrically decaying average of past absolute returns with $\rho = 0.80$.
MaxMin95	Measure of volatility $(1-\rho)\sum_{s=0}^{\infty}\rho^s(\log(p^h_{t-1-s}) - \log(p^l_{t-1-s}))$ with $\rho = 0.95$, where p^h and p^l are the highest and lowest prices.
MaxMin80	Measure of volatility with $\rho = 0.80$.
CloseSqr95	Geometrically decaying average of returns $((1-\rho)\sum_{s=0}^{\infty}\rho^s y^2_{t-2-s})^{1/2}$ with $\rho = 0.95$.
CloseSqr80	Geometrically decaying average of returns with $\rho = 0.80$.

and S&P600 (Nelsen, 2006). Figure 3 also suggests that the positive dependence restriction of the Joe-Clayton copula is appropriate for modeling the data without rotating the scale. Furthermore, Joe (2005) shows that the usual two-stage approach for copula estimation is not efficient for extreme dependence near the Fréchet bounds, which is the case in our application.

5.2. **Posterior summary.** We present the posterior summary for the model in Table 3. The conditional link function is used for the dependent Kendall's τ and lower tail-dependence. The efficiency of the MCMC is monitored via the inefficiency factor $\text{IF} = 1 + 2\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\rho_i$, where ρ_i is the autocorrelation at lag i in the MCMC iterations.

Note that our marginal models are similar to the model in Li et al. (2010) except that the location parameter of the split-t is fixed in Li et al. (2010). We also estimated the model with the independent link for comparison. The mean posterior acceptance probability is 71% in comparison to 50% when the independent link function is used.

We focus on explaining the results in the copula component and refer to Li et al. (2010) for a detailed interpretation of the marginal models. The variable selection results show that important variables for Kendall's τ are RM1, RM5, CloseAbs80 and MaxMin95 in the S&P600 margin and the variables CloseAbs80, MaxMin95 , MaxMin80 and CloseSqr95 in the S&P100 margin. Variables with large posterior inclusion probabilities in the lower-tail dependence part are: CloseSqr95, RM1 and RM5 in S&P600 margin and RM1, RM20 and CloseAbs80 from the variables in the S&P100 margin. Multicollinearity may occur when the same variables are used in a margin and in the copula parameters. Figure 4 shows that the same covariate in S&P100 and in S&P600 tend to be highly correlated. Since covariates in both margins are used in the copula, there is a risk of covariate duplication with associated problems with non-identification. Table 3 shows that when a covariate in one margin is selected in the copula feature, the same covariate in the other margin does not appear in the copula, which indicates that our variable selection algorithm is efficient in removing superfluous covariates.



FIGURE 2. Daily return of the S&P100 and S&P600 indices from September 15, 1995 to January 16, 2013.



FIGURE 3. The empirical copula for daily return of S&P100 and S&P600 indices from September 15, 1995 to January 16, 2013 (middle) and the Fréchet-Hoeffding lower bound copula (left) and Fréchet-Hoeffding upper bound copula (right).

TABLE 3. Posterior summary of copula model with S&P100 and S&P600 data. In the copula component part, the first row and second row for β and $\mathcal{I}$ are the results for the combined covariates that are used in the first and second marginal model, respectively. The intercept are always included in the model.

	Intercept	RM1	RM5	RM20	CloseAbs95	CloseAbs80	MaxMin95	MaxMin80	CloseSqr95	CloseSqr80
					Marginal component (1)					
β_μ	0.222	−0.076	−0.104	0.096	0.205	−0.385	0.090	0.173	−0.316	0.372
$\mathcal{I}_\mu$	1	0.15	0.09	0.08	0.06	0.11	0.11	0.10	0.03	0.05
β_ϕ	−0.001	−0.019	−0.118	**−0.050**	0.143	−0.283	**0.021**	0.005	0.070	0.352
$\mathcal{I}_\phi$	1	0.01	0.091	**0.89**	0.01	0.00	**0.92**	0.07	0.00	0.00
β_ν	0.900	−0.088	−0.401	0.263	−0.500	−0.832	0.851	−0.053	−0.802	−0.592
$\mathcal{I}_\nu$	1	0.15	0.00	0.01	0.16	0.12	0.05	0.05	0.11	0.02
β_κ	−0.272	0.007	0.009	−0.061	−0.451	0.512	0.003	−0.357	0.445	−0.241
$\mathcal{I}_\kappa$	1	0.02	0.16	0.19	0.02	0.13	0.10	0.19	0.11	0.15
					Marginal component (2)					
β_μ	0.260	0.150	−0.089	0.044	0.173	−0.079	0.306	−0.124	−0.037	0.164
$\mathcal{I}_\mu$	1	0.20	0.17	0.10	0.05	0.03	0.11	0.05	0.14	0.14
β_ϕ	0.208	0.025	**−0.127**	−0.042	−0.002	−0.300	0.145	0.165	0.066	0.291
$\mathcal{I}_\phi$	1	.10	**1.00**	0.09	0.03	0.00	0.01	0.11	0.03	0.07
β_ν	2.843	0.091	−0.435	−0.612	0.417	−0.388	0.299	−0.270	0.338	−0.467
$\mathcal{I}_\nu$	1.00	0.10	0.13	0.03	0.04	0.10	0.12	0.18	0.08	0.12
β_κ	−0.265	−0.104	0.059	−0.055	0.389	−0.197	−0.708	0.401	0.253	−0.110
$\mathcal{I}_\kappa$	1	0.06	0.02	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.09	0.00	0.06	0.05
					Copula component (C)					
β_{λ_L}	−8.165	**−0.555**	1.793	**0.005**	−0.170	**0.110**	−0.667	−1.448	−0.636	0.050
		1.463	**0.405**	0.934	−2.138	−1.288	−1.954	−1.577	**−1.873**	−1.805
$\mathcal{I}_{\lambda_L}$	1.00	**0.98**	0.37	**0.63**	0.02	**0.61**	0.36	0.35	0.39	0.29
		1.00	**1.00**	0.00	0.30	0.35	0.40	0.00	**0.61**	0.34
β_τ	−1.726	0.181	−0.217	−0.304	−0.107	**0.115**	**0.005**	**−0.257**	**1.068**	0.037
		−0.191	**0.170**	0.274	0.144	**−0.051**	**−0.671**	0.059	−0.209	−0.181
$\mathcal{I}_\tau$	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	**0.90**	**0.99**	**1.00**	**0.85**	0.00
		1.00	**1.00**	0.00	0.00	**1.00**	**1.00**	0.00	0.00	0.00

The inefficiency factors for the parameters are all bellow 25.



FIGURE 4. The pairwise scatter plot for the same covariate in S&P100 (in x-axis) and S&P600 (in y-axis) margins that also enters in the copula function.

Figure 5 shows a correlation between S&P100 and S&P600 indices with the posterior mean of Kendall's τ being rather stable around 0.3 over time (bottom left subgraph). The tail-dependence is not so strong during normal time, but there is significant variation over time (bottom right subgraph). The variation in λ_L over time is larger than the variation in Kendall's τ and there is a very high dependence in the tail even though the overall correlation is relatively small.

Figure 6 depicts the posterior contour plot for the Joe-Clayton copula model for some random dates before and during the 2008 financial crisis. By comparing with the Fréchet-Hoeffding upper bound in Figure 3, we can see that the lower tail-dependence is higher during the crisis in comparison to the dates before the crisis. Also note that the empirical copula overestimates the dependence during normal time and underestimates the dependence during the 2008 financial crisis because it assumes temporally independent observations. Our covariate-dependent copula model not only captures but also estimates the dynamic dependence.



FIGURE 5. The posterior mean for the model parameters with S&P100 and S&P600 data from September 15, 1995 to January 16, 2013. The first four rows of subplots show time series plots of the location, scale, degrees of freedom and skewness parameters in margin S&P100 (left) and S&P600 (right). The subplots on the last row are the time series plot for Kendall's τ (bottom-left) and the lower tail-dependence (bottom-right). The dashed vertical bars indicate the beginning of the 2008 financial crisis.



FIGURE 6. Contour plot for the posterior copula. The two leftmost columns show contour plots of the estimated copula and its density at five random dates before the 2008 financial crisis. The contour plots in each column are ordered with respect to the lower tail-dependence. The two rightmost columns show the same plots but for five dates during the 2008 financial crisis.

TABLE 4. Model comparison with LPS. Note that variable selection is used in all situations in the margins.

	LPS	Numerical standard error
No-covariates in τ and λ	-1324	0.5
Covariates in τ and λ - no variable selection	-1250	1.2
Covariates in τ and λ - variable selection	-1238	1.1

5.3. **Model comparison.** We evaluating the model performance based on out-of-sample prediction. In our time series application, we estimate the model based on the 80% of historical data and then predict the last 20% data. We evaluate the quality of the one-step-ahead predictions using the log predictive score (LPS)

$$\text{LPS} = \log p(D_{(T+1):(T+p)}|D_{1:T}) = \sum\nolimits_{i=1}^{p} \log \int p(D_{T+i}|\theta, D_{1:(T+i-1)}) p(\theta|D_{1:(T+i-1)}) \mathrm{d}\theta$$

where $D_{a:b}$ is the dataset from time a to b and θ are the model parameters. This calculation of the LPS is usually computationally costly because every prediction needs a new posterior sample from the posterior based on the data available at the time of the forecast. We approximate the LPS by assuming that the posterior does not change much as we add a few data points to the estimation sample. This approximation has the advantage that we can parallelize the LPS evaluation on multiple processors.Villani et al. (2009) document that this type of approximation is accurate in an application of smooth mixture of Gaussians for density predictions of the S&P500 data.

Table 4 shows the out-of-sample comparison of models. Models with covariates in the copula features outperforms the commonly used model without covariates in the copula. Moreover, variable selection also enhances the model's predictive performance.

6. Concluding remarks

We have proposed a general approach for modeling a covariate-dependent copula. The copula parameters as well as the parameters in the margins are linked to covariates. We use an efficient Bayesian MCMC method to sample the posterior distribution and to simultaneously perform variable selection in all parts of the model. An application to the daily returns of S&P100 and S&P600 indices shows the advantages of this approach in terms of understanding the copula dependence via covariates and improved out-of-sample prediction performance. Covariate-dependent copula modeling with discrete margins is also possible using the data augmentation in Pitt et al. (2006) and Smith & Khaled (2012).

7. Acknowledgements

This work was initiated during the author's visit to Division of Statistics, Department of Computing and Information Science at Linköping University in the winter 2011.

Appendix A. The MCMC details

In this section, we briefly present the MCMC details. The MCMC implementation is straightforward, but requires great care of the proposal distribution in the Metropolis–Hastings algorithm.

A.1. **The chain rule.** We use the finite-step Newton method embedded in the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm that requires the analytical gradient for the posterior with respect to the parameters of interest in marginal and copula components. The chain rule of gradient conveniently modularizes the copula model and reduces the complexity of the the gradient calculation.

A.1.1. *The chain rule for copula parameters.*

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial \log c(u_1,...,u_M,\lambda_L,\tau)}{\partial \lambda_L} =& \frac{\partial \log c(u_1,...,u_M,\theta,\delta)}{\partial \delta} \times \left(\frac{\partial \lambda_L}{\partial \delta}\right)^{-1} \\
\frac{\partial \log c(u_1,...,u_m,\lambda_L,\tau)}{\partial \tau} =& \frac{\partial \log c(u_1,...,u_m,\theta,\delta)}{\partial \theta} \times \left(\frac{\partial \tau(\theta,\delta)}{\partial \theta}\right)^{-1} \\
\frac{\partial \log c(u_1,...,u_M,\lambda_L,\tau)}{\partial \varphi_m} =& \frac{\partial \log c(u_1,...,u_M,\theta,\delta)}{\partial u_m} \times \frac{\partial u_m}{\partial \varphi}
\end{aligned}$$

where φ_m is any parameter in the m:th margin and u_m is the CDF function of its marginal density. The parameters θ and δ are the intermediate parameters that link the dependence and correlations with the traditional parametrization for copulas.

The MCMC algorithm requires evaluating $\tau_{\lambda_L}^{-1}$ excessively. It can be evaluated numerically or through a dictionary-lookup method. In practice, we have found that the dictionary-lookup method is particularly fast and robust. Modeling the upper tail-dependence can be done in the same manner.

Our model in Section 2 is covariate-dependent. Let $l(\varphi) = x'\beta$ be the link function where φ is the parameter of interest. The gradient expression can be written as

$$\frac{\partial \log c(u_1,...,u_M,\varphi)}{\partial \beta} = \frac{\partial \log c(u_1,...,u_M,\varphi)}{\partial \varphi} \times \left(\frac{\partial l(\varphi)}{\partial \varphi}\right)^{-1} \times \frac{\partial x'\beta}{\partial \beta}.$$

When the conditional link function is used, e.g. τ depending on λ_L in our model in the link function $l(\tau|\lambda_L) = x'\beta$, the gradient for λ_L is slightly complicated. One needs to write τ as a function of λ_L with the link function and substitute it into the copula density. The gradient for λ_L is obtained thereafter. The details are straightforward, but lengthy, and will be omitted here.

A.2. **Gradients for parameters in Joe-Clayton copula.** The gradient for the Joe-Clayton copula w.r.t lower tail-dependence parameters λ_L can be decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial \log c(u,v,\theta,\delta)}{\partial \delta} =& -\log T_1(u) - \log T_1(v) - \frac{2(1+\delta)\Delta_1}{\delta L_1} - (\frac{1}{\theta} - 2)\frac{\log L_1 - \delta \Delta_1/L_1}{\delta^2(L_1^{1/\delta} - 1)} \\
&+ \frac{2\log L_1}{\delta^2} + \frac{L_1^{1/\delta} - (1+\delta)L_1^{1/\delta}(\log L_1 - \delta\Delta_1/L_1)/\delta^2 - 1}{(1+\delta)L_1^{1/\delta} - \delta - 1/\theta},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta_1 = \partial L_1/\partial\delta = -T_1(u)^{-\delta}\log T_1(u) - T_1(v)^{-\delta}\log T_1(v)$. Furthermore, $\partial\lambda_L/\partial\delta = 2^{-1/\delta}\log 2/\delta^2$.

The gradient for Joe-Clayton copula with respect to the Kendall's τ is decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial \log c(u,v,\theta,\delta)}{\partial\theta} =& -(1+\delta)\Delta_2(0) + \Delta_3(u) + \Delta_3(v) + 2(1+\delta)\Delta_2(-\delta)/L_1 \\ &+ \frac{(1-2\theta)\Delta_2(1/\delta)}{(1-L_1^{-1/\delta})\theta\delta} - \frac{\log(1-L_1^{-1/\delta})}{\theta^2} \\ &+ \frac{(1+\delta)L_1^{1/\delta} + \theta(1+\delta)/\delta L_1^{1/\delta-1}\Delta_2(-1/\delta) - \delta}{(1+\delta)\theta L_1^{1/\delta} - \theta\delta - 1}\end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta_2(d) = -T_1(u)^{d-1}(1-u)^{\theta}\log(1-u) - T_1(v)^{d-1}(1-v)^{\theta}\log(1-v)$ and $\Delta_3(s) = \partial \log T_2(s)/\partial\theta = (1-s)^{\theta-1}\log(1-s)/T_2(s)$. Furthermore,

$$\frac{\partial\tau(\theta,\delta)}{\partial\theta} = \begin{cases} -2/[(\theta-2)^2\delta] - 8B(2+\delta, 2/\theta-1)\left[\theta + \psi(2/\theta-1) - \psi(2/\theta+\delta+1)\right]/(\theta^4\delta), \\ \qquad\qquad 1 \le \theta < 2; \\ -[12 + 24\psi(1) + 6\psi^2(1) + \pi^2 - 12(2+\psi(1))\psi(2+\delta) + 6\psi^2(2+\delta) - 6\psi_1(2+\delta)]/(24\delta), \\ \qquad\qquad \theta = 2; \\ \dfrac{\begin{pmatrix} -2(2+\delta)\theta^4 B(1+\delta+2/\theta, 2-2/\theta) - 8\pi^2(\theta-2)^2\cos(2\pi/\theta)/\sin^2(2\pi/\theta) \\ -8\pi(\theta-2)^2[\psi(1+\delta+2/\theta) - \psi(2-2/\theta) - \theta]/\sin(2\pi/\theta) \end{pmatrix}}{\delta(2+\delta)(\theta-2)^2\theta^4 B(1+\delta+2/\theta, 2-2/\theta)}, \\ \qquad\qquad \theta > 2. \end{cases}$$

where $\psi_1(\cdot)$ is the trigamma function. then gradient for the case $\theta = 2$ can be obtained by taking the limiting result from the cases of $1 \le \theta < 2$ or $\theta > 2$ when $\theta \to 2$.

$$\frac{\partial\tau(\theta,\delta)}{\partial\delta} = \begin{cases} -2/[(\theta-2)\delta^2] + 4B(2+\delta, 2/\theta-1)[\psi(2+\delta) - \psi(2/\theta+\delta+1) - 1/\delta]/(\theta^2\delta), \\ \qquad\qquad 1 \le \theta < 2; \\ [\psi(2+\delta) - \delta\psi_1(2+\delta) - \psi(1) - 1]/\delta^2, \qquad \theta = 2; \\ -\dfrac{2}{(\theta-2)\delta^2} - \dfrac{4\pi[\psi(3+\delta) - \psi(2/\theta+\delta+1) - 2(1+\delta)/(2\delta+\delta^2)]}{(2+\delta)\delta\theta^2\sin(2\pi/\theta)B(1+\delta+2/\theta, 2-2/\theta)}, \\ \qquad\qquad \theta > 2. \end{cases}$$

For the Joe-Clayton copula, u and v are exchangeable, and we only present the derivative with respect to u:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial \log c(u,v,\theta,\delta)}{\partial u} =& (1+\delta)\theta\Delta_4(0) + (1-\theta)[(1-u)^{\theta-2}/T_2(u) + (1-v)^{\theta-2}/T_2(v)] \\ &- 2(1+\delta)\Delta_4(-\delta)/L_1 - (1/\theta-2)L_1^{-1/\delta-1}\Delta_4(-\delta)/(1-L_1^{-1/\delta}) \\ &- (1+\delta)\theta L_1^{1/\delta-1}\Delta_4(-\delta)/\left[(1+\delta)\theta L_1^{1/\delta} - \theta\delta - 1\right]\end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta_4(d) = -T_1(u)^{d-1}(1-u)^{\theta-1}\theta - T_1(v)^{d-1}(1-v)^{\theta-1}\theta$.

A.3. **Gradients for parameters in marginal distributions.** The direct derivative of CDF function with respect to its parameters is straightforward for most densities. We only document the split-t case. Let $I = \kappa$ if $y > \mu$ and $I = 1$ elsewhere, $J = 1$, if $y > \mu$ and $J = -1$, and $A = I^2\nu\phi^2/[(y-\mu)^2 + I^2\nu\phi^2]$, the gradient for the split-t CDF function with respect to it parameters μ, ϕ, κ, ν are as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial u_{split-t}(y,\mu,\phi,\kappa,\nu)}{\partial \mu} =& -\frac{2I\sqrt{\frac{1}{(y-\mu)^2+I^2\nu\phi^2}}A^{\nu/2}}{(1+\kappa)\text{Beta}\left[\frac{\nu}{2},\frac{1}{2}\right]},\\
\frac{\partial u_{split-t}(y,\mu,\phi,\kappa,\nu)}{\partial \phi} =& -\frac{2I(y-\mu)\sqrt{\frac{1}{(y-\mu)^2+I^2\nu\phi^2}}A^{\nu/2}}{(1+\kappa)\phi\text{Beta}\left[\frac{\nu}{2},\frac{1}{2}\right]},\\
\frac{\partial u_{split-t}(y,\mu,\phi,\kappa,\nu)}{\partial \phi} =& \begin{cases} -\frac{\text{Beta}_R\left[A,\frac{\nu}{2},\frac{1}{2}\right]}{(1+\kappa)^2} & y<\mu \\ -\frac{2(1+\kappa)(y-\mu)\sqrt{\frac{1}{(y-\mu)^2+\kappa^2\nu\phi^2}}A^{\nu/2}+\text{Beta}\left[A,\frac{\nu}{2},\frac{1}{2}\right]}{(1+\kappa)^2\text{Beta}\left[\frac{\nu}{2},\frac{1}{2}\right]} & \text{elsewhere,}\end{cases}\\
\frac{\partial u_{split-t}(y,\mu,\phi,\kappa,\nu)}{\partial \phi} =& \frac{I}{2(1+\kappa)\nu^2\text{Beta}\left[\frac{\nu}{2},\frac{1}{2}\right]}\left\{4JA^{\nu/2}{}_pF_q\left[\left\{\frac{1}{2},\frac{\nu}{2},\frac{\nu}{2}\right\},\left\{1+\frac{\nu}{2},1+\frac{\nu}{2}\right\},A\right]\right.\\
&+\nu\left(-2(y-\mu)\sqrt{\frac{1}{(y-\mu)^2+\kappa^2\nu\phi^2}}A^{\nu/2}\right.\\
&\left.\left.-\nu J\ \text{Beta}\left[A,\frac{\nu}{2},\frac{1}{2}\right]\left(\log(A)-\psi\left(\frac{\nu}{2}\right)+\psi\left(\frac{1+\nu}{2}\right)\right)\right)\right\}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\text{Beta}_R$is the regularized beta function, ${}_pF_q$ is the generalized hypergeometric function.

However there are exceptions when this derivative is numerically unstable in practice. In this situation, we propose an alternative approach. Note that

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial \varphi} = \frac{\partial F(y,\varphi)}{\partial \varphi} = \int_{-\infty}^{y}\frac{\partial f(x,\varphi)}{\partial \varphi}\mathrm{d}x \tag{4}$$

where $u = F(y,\varphi)$ is the CDF function of density $f(y,\varphi)$, and calculating $\partial f(y,\varphi)/\partial\varphi$ is usually easier than $\partial F(y,\varphi)/\partial\varphi$. When the integral cannot be easily obtained analytically, numerical methods can be applied in the last stage. Furthermore, Equation (4) has the advantage of connecting existing derivatives of the PDF with respect to its parameters, e.g. Li et al. (2010) (asymmetric student-t density where asymmetric normal and symmetric student-t densities are its special cases), Li et al. (2011) (gamma and log-normal densities) and Villani et al. (2012) (negative binomial, beta and generalized Poisson densities) and Li & Villani (2013) (spline model with free knots as unknown parameters).

References

Aas, K., Czado, C., Frigessi, A. & Bakken, H. (2009). Pair-copula constructions of multiple dependence. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* **44**, 182–198.

Bouyé, E. & Salmon, M. (2009). Dynamic copula quantile regressions and tail area dynamic dependence in Forex markets. *The European Journal of Finance* **15**, 721–750.

Clayton, D. (1978). A model for association in bivariate life tables and its application in epidemiological studies of familial tendency in chronic disease incidence. *Biometrika* **65**, 141–151.

Czado, C. (2010). Pair-copula constructions of multivariate copulas. In *Copula theory and its applications: proceedings of the workshop held in Warsaw, 25-26 September 2009*, P. Jaworski, F. Durante, W. K. Härdle & T. Rychlik, eds. Springer, pp. 93–109.

Czado, C., Schepsmeier, U. & Min, A. (2012). Maximum likelihood estimation of mixed c-vines with application to exchange rates. *Statistical Modelling* **12**, 229–255.

Dobrić, J. & Schmid, F. (2005). Nonparametric estimation of the lower tail dependence λ_L in bivariate copulas. *Journal of Applied Statistics* **32**, 387–407.

Dorota, K. (2010). *Dependence Modeling: Vine Copula Handbook*. World Scientific.

Draisma, G., Drees, H., Ferreira, A. & De Haan, L. (2004). Bivariate tail estimation: dependence in asymptotic independence. *Bernoulli* **10**, 251–280.

Durrleman, V., Nikeghbali, A. & Roncalli, T. (2000). A simple tranformation of copulas. *Working paper* Groupe de Recherce Operationelle, Credit Lyonnais, France.

García, J. E., González-López, V. & Nelsen, R. (2013). A new index to measure positive dependence in trivariate distributions. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **115**, 481–495.

Jaworski, P., Durante, F., Härdle, W. K. & Rychlik, T. (2010). *Copula theory and its applications: proceedings of the workshop held in Warsaw, 25-26 September 2009*, vol. 198. Springer.

Joe, H. (1993). Parametric families of multivariate distributions with given margins. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **46**, 262–282.

Joe, H. (1997). *Multivariate models and dependence concepts*. Chapman & Hall, London.

Joe, H. (2005). Asymptotic efficiency of the two-stage estimation method for copula-based models. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **94**, 401–419.

Ledford, A. W. & Tawn, J. a. (1997). Modelling Dependence within Joint Tail Regions. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **59**, 475–499.

Li, F. & Villani, M. (2013). Efficient Bayesian multivariate surface regression. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* **40**, 706–723.

Li, F., Villani, M. & Kohn, R. (2010). Flexible modeling of conditional distributions using smooth mixtures of asymmetric student t densities. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* **140**, 3638–3654.

Li, F., Villani, M. & Kohn, R. (2011). Modeling conditional densities using finite smooth mixtures. In *Mixtures: estimation and applications*, K. Mengersen, C. Robert & M. Titterington, eds. John Wiley & Sons Inc, Chichester, pp. 123–144.

Mardia, K. & Kent, J. (1979). *Multivariate analysis*. Academic Press, London.

Nelsen, R. (2006). *An introduction to copulas*. Springer Verlag.

Nott, D. & Kohn, R. (2005). Adaptive sampling for Bayesian variable selection. *Biometrika* **92**, 747–763.

Patton, A. (2006). Modelling asymmetric exchange rate dependence. *International economic review* **47**, 527–556.

Patton, A. (2012a). Copula methods for forecasting multivariate time series. *Handbook of Economic Forecasting* , 1–76.

Patton, A. (2012b). A review of copula models for economic time series. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **110**, 4–18.

Pitt, M., Chan, D. & Kohn, R. (2006). Efficient Bayesian inference for Gaussian copula regression models. *Biometrika* **93**, 537–554.

Schmidt, R. & Stadtmuller, U. (2006). Non-parametric Estimation of Tail Dependence. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* **33**, 307–335.

Sklar, A. (1959). Fonctions de répartition à n dimensions et leurs marges. *Publications de l'Institut de Statistique de L'Université de Paris* **8**, 229–231.

Smith, M. & Khaled, M. (2012). Estimation of copula models with discrete margins via Bayesian data augmentation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **107**, 290–303.

Vach, K., Sauerbrei, W. & Schumacher, M. (2001). Variable selection and shrinkage: comparison of some approaches. *Statistica Neerlandica* **55**.

Villani, M., Kohn, R. & Giordani, P. (2009). Regression density estimation using smooth adaptive Gaussian mixtures. *Journal of Econometrics* **153**, 155–173.

Villani, M., Kohn, R. & Nott, D. J. (2012). Generalized smooth finite mixtures. *Journal of Econometrics* **171**, 121–133.

Xu, J. (1996). *Statistical modelling and inference for multivariate and longitudinal discrete response data*. Ph.D. thesis, Department of Statistics, University of British Columbia.